UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/557,153	04/24/2000	Charles C. Brackett	15UL-5584	7268

23566 7590 04/09/2003

OSTRAGER CHONG & FLAHERTY LLP
825 THIRD AVE
30TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10022-7519

EXAMINER
FRENEL, VANEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3626	

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/557,153	Applicant(s) BRACKETT, CHARLES C.	
	Examiner Vanel Frenel	Art Unit 3626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 January 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed January 21, 2003.

Claims 1-18 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Teshima (6,272,470) in view of Roewer (5,734,915).

(A) As per claim 1, Teshima discloses an imaging

system comprising:

a networking port for communicating with a remote device on a network

(Col.6,lines 49-67; Col.7, line 17);

an operator interface for inputting operating instructions(Col.5, lines 1-

34);

a display screen (Col.7, lines 24-27);

an exam description list manager programmed to manage a list of exam descriptions based on operating instructions received via said operator interface and then control said display screen to display said stored list of exam descriptions (Col.13,lines 48-67 to Col.14, line 59);

memory storing acquired frames of image data in respective image files and storing said list of exam descriptions (Col.4, lines 56-65);

an object constructing task for constructing a data object comprising a frame of image data from one of **said image** files and an associated exam description (Col.13, lines 48-67 to Col.14, line 59);

means for selecting said associated exam description from said list (Col.8, lines 55-65); and

a network manager for transferring said data object from said object constructing task to said networking port destined for said remote device (Col.8, lines 16-27).

Teshima does not explicitly disclose an image acquisition subsystem for acquiring frames of image data. However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Roewer. In particular, Roewer teaches an image

acquisition subsystem for acquiring frames of image data (See Roewer Col.11, lines 45-54; Col.17, lines 8-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Roewer within the system of Teshima with the motivation of providing hospital technologists, radiologists, attending or consulting physicians typically focus on the tasks of accessing, viewing, displaying, and printing medical imagery. Operators select a patient's images to compose and study for medical diagnosis. Operators select imagery and may choose to print, store or edit and annotate the imagery. Thus a simple and fast interface is needed to help increase speed, provide for an efficient work flow, and facilitate use by the non-computer literate operators (See Roewer Col.4, lines 20-30).

(B) As per claim 2, Roewer discloses the system wherein said exam description list manager is further programmed to insert a new exam description in alphabetical order in said list in response to entry of said new exam description in an Edit field on said display screen and activation of a virtual Add button on said display screen (Col.12, lines 52-67 to Col.13, line 33).

(C) As per claim 3, Roewer discloses the system wherein said exam description list manager is further programmed to delete an exam description in said list in response to entry of said exam description in an Edit field on said display screen and activation of a virtual Delete button on said display screen (See Roewer Col.40, lines 40-67).

(D) As per claim 4, Roewer discloses the system wherein said exam description list manager is further programmed to delete all exam descriptions in said list in response **to activation** of a virtual Delete All button on said display screen (Col.10, lines 1-57).

(E) As per claim 5, Teshima discloses an imaging system comprising:

an operator interface for inputting operating instructions (Col.5, lines 1-34);

a display screen (Col.7, lines 24-27);

memory storing said list of exam descriptions (Col.4, lines 56-65).

Teshima does not explicitly disclose means for controlling said display screen to display a user-interactive menu comprising a multiplicity of aligned fields for displaying a list of exam descriptions, one exam description per field, an edit field for entry of an exam description via

said operator interface, and a virtual button activatable via said operator interface for initiating a list edit function;

means for editing said list of exam descriptions based on said entry in said edit field and in accordance with said list edit function in response to activation of said virtual button.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Roewer. In particular, Roewer teaches controlling said display screen to display a user-interactive menu comprising a multiplicity of aligned fields for displaying a list of exam descriptions, one exam description per field, an edit field for entry of an exam description via said operator interface, and a virtual button activatable via said operator interface for initiating a list edit function (Col.5, lines 48-60; Col.12, lines 11-45-67; Col.12, line 67);

> means for editing said list of exam descriptions based on said entry in said edit field and in accordance with said list edit function in response to activation of said virtual button (Col.12, lines 57-67 toCol.13, line 34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Roewer within the system of Teshima with the motivation pf providing hospital technologists, radiologists, attending or consulting physicians typically focus on the tasks of accessing, viewing, displaying, and printing medical imagery. Operators select a patient's images to compose and study for medical diagnosis. Operators select imagery

and may choose to print, store or edit and annotate the imagery. Thus a simple and fast interface is needed to help increase speed, provide for an efficient work flow, and facilitate use by the non-computer-literate operators (See Roewer Col.4, lines 20-30).

(F) As per claim 6,Roewer discloses the system wherein said list of exam descriptions comprises a linked list of alphabetically ordered elements (Col.12,lines 57-64).

(G) As per claim 7,Roewer discloses the system wherein said edit list function comprises entry addition, and said list editing means comprise means for inserting said edit field entry in alphabetical order in said list (Col.12, lines 57-67).

(H) As per claim 8,Roewer discloses the system wherein said edit list function comprises entry deletion, and said list editing means comprise means for deleting said edit field entry from said list (Col.9, lines 18-29).

(I) As per claim 9,Roewer discloses the system wherein said edit list function comprises deletion of all list entries, and said list editing means comprise means for deleting all entries in said list (Col.11, lines 1-23).

(J) As per claim 10, Teshima discloses the system further comprising:

a networking port for communicating with a remote device on a network (Col.6,lines 49-67; Col.7, line 17);

memory storing acquired frames of image data in respective image files(Col.4, lines 56-65);

an object constructing task for constructing a data object comprising a frame of image data from one of said image files and an associated exam description selected from said list displayed on said user-interactive menu via said operator interface (Col.13,lines 48-67 to Col.14, line 59); and

a network manager for transferring said data object from said object constructing task to said networking port destined for said remote device (Col.8,lines 16-27).

Teshima does not explicitly disclose an image acquisition subsystem for acquiring frames of image data. However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Roewer. In particular, Roewer teaches an image acquisition subsystem for acquiring frames of image data (See Roewer Fig.10, Fig.12A, Fig.12B; Col.11,lines 45-54; Col.17,lines 8-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Roewer within the system of Teshima with the motivation of providing hospital technologists, radiologists, attending or consulting physicians) typically focus on the tasks of accessing, viewing, displaying, and printing medical imagery. Operators select a patient's images to compose and study for medical diagnosis. Operators select imagery and may choose to print, store or edit and annotate the imagery. Thus a simple and fast interface is needed to help increase speed, provide for an efficient work flow, and facilitate use by the non-computer-literate operators (See Roewer Col.4, lines 20-30).

(K) As per claim 11,Teshima discloses an imaging system comprising:

an operator interface for inputting operating instructions (Col.7, lines 18-67);

a display screen (Col.7,lines 24-27);

computer memory (Col.7, lines 35-43); and

a computer programmed to perform the following steps (Col.7,lines 18-43):

(c) storing said list of exam descriptions in said memory (Col.8, lines 35-65).

Teshima does not explicitly disclose:

(a) controlling said display screen to display a user-interactive menu comprising a multiplicity of aligned fields for displaying a list of exam descriptions, one exam description per field, an edit field for entry of an exam description via said operator interface, and a virtual button activatable via said operator interface for initiating a list edit function;

(b) editing said list of exam descriptions based on said entry in said edit field and in accordance with said list edit function in response to activation of said virtual button.

However, these features are known in the art, as evidenced by Roewer. In particular, Roewer teaches controlling said display screen to display a user-interactive menu comprising a multiplicity of aligned fields for displaying a list of exam descriptions, one exam description per field,an edit field for entry of an exam description via said operator interface, and a virtual button activatable via said operator interface for initiating a list edit function (Col.5, lines 48-60; Col.12, lines 11-45-67; Col.12, line 67);

(b) editing said list of exam descriptions based on said entry in said edit field and in accordance with said list edit function in response to activation of said virtual button (Col.12,lines 57-67 toCol.13,line 34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Roewer within the system of Teshima with the motivation pf providing hospital technologists, radiologists, attending or consulting physicians) typically focus on the tasks of accessing, viewing, displaying, and printing medical imagery. Operators select a patient's images to compose and study for medical diagnosis. Operators select imagery and may choose to print, store or edit and annotate the imagery. Thus a simple and fast interface is needed to help increase speed, provide for an efficient work flow,and facilitate use by the non-computer literate operators (See Roewer Col.4, lines 20-30).

(L) As per claim 12, Roewer discloses the system wherein said list of exam descriptions comprises a linked list of alphabetically ordered elements (Col.12, lines 57-67).

(M) As per claim 13, Roewer discloses the system wherein said edit list function comprises entry addition, and said editing step comprises the step of

inserting said edit field entry in alphabetical order (Col.12, lines 57-67 to Col.I3, line 33; Col.40, lines 40-67).

(N) As per claim 14,Roewer discloses the system wherein said edit list function comprises entry deletion, and said editing step comprises the step of deleting said edit field entry from said list(Col.13, lines 8-17; Col.40, lines 40-67).

(O) As per claim 15,Roewer discloses the system wherein said edit list function comprises deletion of all list entries, and said editing step comprises the step of deleting all entries in said list (The Examiner interprets remove imagery from a frame or transfer the image to another frame as a form of deletion of all list entries, and said editing step comprises the step of deleting all entries in said list (Col.12, lines 1-23).

(P) As per claim 16,Teshima the system further comprising a networking port for communicating with a remote device on a network, wherein said computer is further programmed with (Col.6, lines 49-67; Col.7, line 17):

> an object constructing task for constructing a data object comprising an acquired frame of image data and an associated exam description

selected from said list displayed on said user-interactive menu via said operator interface (Col.13, lines 48-67 to Col.14,line 59); and

a network manager for transferring said data object from said object constructing task to said networking port destined for said remote device (Col.8,lines 16-27). Teshima does not disclose an image acquisition subsystem for acquiring frames of image data.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Roewer. In particular, Roewer teaches an image acquisition subsystem for acquiring frames of image data ((See Roewer Fig.10,Fig.12A,Fig.12B; Col.11, lines 45-54; Col.17, lines 8-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Roewer within the system of Teshima with the motivation of providing hospital technologists, radiologists, attending or consulting physicians typically focus on the tasks of accessing, viewing, displaying, and printing medical imagery. Operators select a patient's images to compose and study for medical diagnosis. Operators select imagery and may choose to print, store or edit and annotate the imagery. Thus a simple and fast interface is needed to help increase speed, provide for an efficient work flow, and facilitate use by the non-computer-literate operators (See Roewer Col.4, lines 20-30).

(Q) As per claim 17, Teshima discloses an imaging system comprising:

an operator interface for inputting operating instructions (Col.7, lines 18-67);

a display screen(Col.7,lines 24-27);

memory storing said list of exam descriptions (Col.8, lines 35-65).

Teshima does not explicitly disclose an exam description list manager programmed to manage a list of exam descriptions based on operating instructions received via said operator interface and then control said display screen to display said stored list of exam descriptions.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Roewer. In particular, Roewer teaches an exam description list manager programmed to manage a list of exam descriptions based on operating instructions received via said operator interface and then control said display screen to display said stored list of exam descriptions (Col.12, lines 16-63;Col.20, lines 1-67 to Col.21,line 35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Roewer within the system of Teshima with the motivation of providing hospital technologists, radiologists, attending or consulting physicians typically

focus on the tasks of accessing, viewing, displaying, and printing medical imagery. Operators select a patient's images to compose and study for medical diagnosis. Operators select imagery and may choose to print, store or edit and annotate the imagery. Thus a simple and fast interface is needed to help increase speed, provide for an efficient work flow, and facilitate use by the non-computer-literate operators (See Roewer Col.4, lines 20-30).

(R) As per claim 18, Roewer discloses the system wherein said exam description list manager is further programmed to insert a new exam description in alphabetical order in said list in response to entry of said new exam description in an Edit field on said display screen and activation of a virtual Add button on said display screen (Col.12, lines 57-67).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 01/21/03 regarding claims 1-18 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments will be addressed hereinbelow in the order in which they appear in the response filed 01/21/03.

(A) At page 2, Applicant argues Teshima does not disclose the term "exam description", the term "list of exam manager", the term " list of exam descriptions". Furthermore, Applicant's argues Teshima does not disclose managing a list of exam descriptions; selecting an exam description from a stored list of exam descriptions;

constructing a data object that includes both an image file and an associated exam description selected from that list. However, Examiner disagrees.

In response to Applicant's arguments, Examiner respectfully notes that Teshima discloses the claimed feature "exam description" which is corresponding to "each consultation record including information of examinations, information of examination-related images, information of physical checkups, and biological information is described in SGML or HTML and contained in a data file (See Teshima, Col.3, lines 36-52).

(B) Further, Examiner respectfully suggests that Teshima discloses selecting an exam description from a stored list of exam descriptions which is corresponding to "the patient's main complaint and the observed physical findings are entered. If necessary, an order is placed for an examination or medication. Otherwise, while a treatment is undertaken, the contents of a therapy are entered. If necessary, the results of past consultation records and periodical physical checkups are listed. The results of a consultation record and periodical physical checkup which may have relation are selected and displayed. The Examiner interprets such feature as Applicant's claimed limitation (See Teshima, Col.4, lines 1-24).

(C) Furthermore, Examiner respectfully suggests that Teshima reference teaches constructing a data object that includes both an image file and an associated exam description selected from that list which is corresponding to data structure to consultation records. The Examiner interprets such feature as Applicant's claimed limitation (See Teshima, Col.9, lines 40-67). The consultation record is composed of a

plurality of plain text files containing texts written in SGML or HTML, and a group of data files containing various data items. The HTML supports a description facilitating reference of an external file. Not only characters but also a still image, motion picture, voice, chart, and list can therefore be handled at the same time". The Examiner interprets such feature as Applicant's claimed limitation (See Teshima, Col.9, lines 40-67).

(D) On page 4, Applicant's argues that Roewer does not disclose a list of exam descriptions, an edit field and user-interactive menu with fields for list items and a separate edit field for entering each item to be added. However, the Examiner disagrees.

In response to Applicant's arguments, Examiner respectfully notes that Roewer discloses an operator manipulates and edits the images using a computer simulation of a radiologist's light table at the workstation. Furhter, the operator sees the operation take place, action upon single or multiples images or objects, pointer and target positions, and highlighting of selected options. Tasks are accomplished by interacting with a combination of graphic user interfaces. The Examiner interprets such feature as Applicant's claimed limitation (See Roewer, Col.8, lines 15-49; Col.16, lines 14-50).

(E) At page 4-5, Applicant argues "Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie of obiousness. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met by the Examiner, as set forth at MPEP 706.02 (j). First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge

generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the combined prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The Examiner has failed to satisfy this last criterion. The combination of Teshima and Roewer does not teach or suggest all the limitations of Applicant's claims because neither reference shows an "exam description list manager" (as recited in independent claims 1 and 17) or a computer programmed to display, edit and store a list of exam descriptions (as recited in independent claim 11) or an imaging system having a graphical user interface having an Edit field for entry of a new or changed exam description and a multiplicity of aligned fields containing respective exam descriptions of a list (as recited in claim 5)". However, Examiner disagrees.

In response to Applicant's arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that obviousness is determined on the basis of the evidence as a whole and the relative persuasiveness of the arguments. See In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443,1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992), In re Hedges, 783 F.2d 1038, 1039, 228 USPQ 685,686 (Fed. Cir. 1992); In re Piasecki, 745F. 2d 1468, 1472, 223 USPQ 785, 788 (Fed. Cir. 1984); and In re Rinehart, 531 F.2d 1048, 1052, 189 USPQ 143, 147 (CCPA 1976). Using this standard, the Examiner, respectfully submits that he has at least satisfied the burden of presenting a prima facie case of obviousness, since he has presented evidence of corresponding claim elements in the prior art and has expressly articulated the combinations and the motivations for combinations that fairly suggest Applicant's claimed invention (See paper number 8).

Rather, Applicant does not point to any specific distinction (s) between the features disclosed in the references and the features that are presently claimed. In particular, 37 CFR 1.111 (b) states, "A general allegation that the claim define a patentable invention without pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the reference does not comply with the requirements of this section". Applicant has failed to specifically point out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the applied references.

Also, arguments or conclusions of Attorney cannot take place of evidence. In re Cole, 51 CCPA 919, 326 F.2d 769, 140 USPQ 230 (1940); In re Schulze, 52 CCPA 1422,346 F.2d 600, 145 USPQ 716 (1965); Mertizner v. Mindick, 549 F.2d 775, 193 USPQ 17 (CCPA 1977).

In addition, the Examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily altered or modified and that there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed modifications. However, although the Examiner agrees that the motivation or suggestion to make motivations must be articulated, it is respectfully contended that there is no requirement that the motivation to make motivations must be expressly articulated within the references themselves. References are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures, In re Bozek, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969).

As such, it is respectfully submitted that an explanation based on logic and sound scientific reasoning of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that support a holding of obviousness has been adequately provided by motivations and

reasons indicated by the Examiner both in the present Office Action as well as the prior Office Action, Ex parte Levengood, 28 USPQ2D 1300 (Bd. Pat. App.& Inter., 4/22/93).

(F) On page 5, Applicant argues Roewer does not diclose "exam description, selecting an exam description from a stored list of exam descriptions, a computer programmed to display, edit and store a list of exam descriptions and the corresponding elements of the Teshima and Roewer references. However, the Examiner disagrees.

In response to Applicant's arguments, Examiner respectfully notes that Roewer discloses a PCW applications are programmed as C language functions. Functions that perform logically related tasks are grouped as applications modules during program development. All programmed functions in a module are then stored as a file, and named in the header file. The Examiner interprets such feature as Applicant's claimed limitation (See Roewer, Col.29, lines 47-67).

In addition, Applicant's argues that neither cited references teaches the alphabetic ordering of exam descriptions in a managed list.

However, Examiner notes that Roewer discloses a PCW applications are programmed as C language functions. Functions that perform logically related tasks are grouped as applications modules during program development. All programmed functions in a module are then stored as a file, and named in the header file. The Examiner interprets such feature as Applicant's claimed limitation (See Roewer, Col.29, lines 47-67).

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied art teaches an electronic medical records system (5,924,074), peripheral ultrasound imaging system (6,440,071) and computer-based medical image distribution system and method (6,260,021).
Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vanel Frenel whose telephone number is 703-305-4952. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 703-305-9643. The fax phone

numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

DINH X. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

V.F

V.F

April 6, 2003